

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/732,674	HEDDEN, RALPH COLEMAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael J. Moore, Jr.	2666	

All Participants:

Status of Application: Condition for Allowance

(1) Michael J. Moore, Jr.

(3) _____

(2) Dennis F. Armijo (Reg. No. 34,116)

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 4 January 2006

Time: 2:00pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Claims 1, 8, 9, and 14 were discussed.

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Michael J. Moore
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

In response to Applicant's Appeal Brief filed 10/14/2005, an Appeal Conference was held on 12/22/05 between Examiner Moore and Supervisory Patent Examiners Seema Rao and Chau Nguyen. Arguments raised by Applicant in the Brief were discussed. The main argument, that Kaplan (U.S. 6,144,641) does not teach physically attaching a "tag" to a digital message, was the main issue under review. It was agreed that Kaplan does not teach physically attaching a "tag" to a digital message. However, it was also agreed that the claim language did not clearly indicate this feature.

Mr. Armijo was then contacted to discuss some possible amendments to the claims to more clearly indicate this feature of the invention. Suggestions by the Examiner were agreed to by Mr. Armijo. These claim amendments are provided in the attached Examiner's Amendment.